arXiv:1702.07893v1 [cs.CG] 25 Feb 2017

THE PERSISTENT HOMOTOPY TYPE DISTANCE

PATRIZIO FROSINI, CLAUDIA LANDI, AND FACUNDO MÉMOLI

Abstract. We introduce the persistent homotopy type distance d_{HT} to compare real valued functions defined on possibly different homotopy equivalent topological spaces. The underlying idea in the definition of d_{HT} is to measure the minimal shift that is necessary to apply to one of the two functions in order that the sublevel sets of the two functions become homotopically equivalent. This distance is interesting in connection with persistent homology. Indeed, our main result states that d_{HT} still provides an upper bound for the bottleneck distance between the persistence diagrams of the intervening functions. Moreover, because homotopy equivalences are weaker than homeomorphisms, this implies a lifting of the standard stability results provided by the L^∞ distance and the natural pseudo-distance d_{NP}. From a different standpoint, we prove that d_{HT} extends the L^∞ distance and d_{NP} in two ways. First, we show that, appropriately restricting the category of objects to which d_{HT} applies, it can be made to coincide with the other two distances. Finally, we show that d_{HT} has an interpretation in terms of interleavings that naturally places it in the family of distances used in persistence theory.

1. Introduction

Persistent homology has been developed as a theory to study topological properties of noisy or incomplete data, establishing itself as a fundamental tool for topological data analysis [10, 14, 4]. Persistent homology is characterized by an invariant called the persistence diagram (also known as the barcode) which summarizes both topological features of a dataset and their prominence. One of the reasons for the success of persistent homology is that persistence diagrams change continuously provided that the input dataset also changes continuously. This is known as the Stability Theorem of Persistence [8]. Usually, (a) changes in persistence homology are measured via the bottleneck distance between persistence diagram, (b) datasets are modeled as real valued functions defined on the same space, and (c) one often uses the L^∞ distance between functions to quantify their changes:

Theorem 1 (Stability theorem [8])**.** *Let X be a compact polyhedron. Then, for all continuous tame functions $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : X \to \mathbb{R}$, and all integers $k \geq 0$,*

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}(D_k(\varphi_1), D_k(\varphi_2)) \leq \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_\infty. \tag{1.1}$$

Above, d_{B} stands for the bottleneck distance between persistence diagrams, and $D_k(\varphi)$ is the persistence diagram corresponding to the k-th homology of the sub-level set filtration of the function φ.

In order to lift the Stability Theorem of Persistence to the case when functions are defined on different, albeit homeomorphic spaces, one can resort to the natural pseudo-distance. If two continuous functions $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ are given on homeomorphic spaces X and Y, then the natural pseudo-distance d_{NP} [9] between them is defined by

$$d_{\mathrm{NP}}\left((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)\right) := \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}_0(X,Y)} \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \circ h\|_\infty \tag{1.2}$$

Date: February 28, 2017.

where $\mathcal{H}_0(X,Y)$ is the set of all homeomorphisms from the topological space X onto the topological space Y. Then, since persistence diagrams of sub-level set filtrations are invariant under reparametrization, one obtains an improvement of inequality (1.1) stated in Theorem 1:

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}(D_k(\varphi_X), D_k(\varphi_Y)) \leq d_{\mathrm{NP}}\big((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)\big). \tag{1.3}$$

However, the natural pseudo-distance is not suitable when we are interested in analyzing functions defined on non-homeomorphic topological spaces.

In this paper we construct a new extended pseudo-metric, called the *persistent homotopy type distance*, denoted d_{HT}, to quantify the distance between real valued functions defined on different spaces which is meaningful when the spaces are at least homotopically equivalent. In plain words, the persistent homotopy type distance is a generalization of the natural pseudo-distance in that it uses homotopy equivalences in place of homeomorphisms. This allows us to use the persistent homotopy type distance to obtain a new and stronger stability theorem for persistent homology, which is the main contribution of our paper:

Theorem 2. *Let X and Y be compact polyhedra, and k be any non-negative integer. Let $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions. Then,*

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}\big(D_k(\varphi_X), D_k(\varphi_Y)\big) \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}\big((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)\big).$$

We note that in the statement above d_{HT} becomes infinity when the underlying spaces above are not homotopically equivalent.

Choosing the class of homotopy equivalences. In the definition (1.2) of the natural pseudo-distance above, one can in fact restrict the set of homeomorphisms to strict subsets $\mathcal{H}(X,Y)$ of $\mathcal{H}_0(X,Y)$.

As shown in previous papers (e.g. [12, 13]), restricting the set of homeomorphisms allows for the application of d_{NP} in cases when the desired invariance is not the one expressed by $\mathcal{H}_0(X,Y)$. For example, two monotonic functions $f, g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with the same set of extrema are equivalent under d_{NP} (and therefore equivalent for standard persistent homology) when every homeomorphism from $[0,1]$ to $[0,1]$ is accepted. Thus, suitably restricting the set of acceptable homeomorphisms would permit distinguishing two such functions.

From a different perspective, since the group of all self-homeomorphisms of a compact space is not itself compact, the possibility of restricting the set of homeomorphisms is also motivated by the desire of working with compact groups. This is useful for obtaining both interesting theorems and good approximations of the considered groups in practice.

Analogously to the ability to specify the sets $\mathcal{H}(X,Y)$ in the case of the natural pseudo-distance, our proposal for a persistent homotopy type distance also permits specifying what constitutes suitable classes of homotopy equivalences, therefore allowing to select the class that is judged more relevant for a given application.

The homotopy type distance as an interlaving distance. Starting with [6, 16], and more recently with [17, 2, 7], a unifying look at all the metrics usually used to state the stability theorems of persistence has been proposed in terms of interleaving distances. Interleavings apply between pairs of functors from the category of ordered reals to any other category. Interleavings are given by pairs of natural transformations between each one of the functors and a *shifted* version of the other functor.

The interleaving distance measures the smallest shift that allows the existence of an interleaving. Since many distances considered in topological data analysis can be formulated in terms of interleavings, it is natural to ask whether the same holds true for the

persistent homotopy type distance. A further contribution of this paper is an affirmative answer to this question.

Organization of the paper. After introducing the persistent homotopy type distance in Section 2, we discuss its properties and give some examples. In Section 3.1, we prove that the bottleneck distance between persistence diagrams is upper-bounded by the persistent homotopy type distance (Theorem 2). In other words, we lift the Stability Theorem of Persistence (Theorem 1) to functions defined on different spaces provided that they are homotopy equivalent. Finally, Section 4 offers an interpretation of the persistent homotopy type distance as an interleaving distance.

2. Mathematical setting

Let us consider the category $\mathbf{S}$ such that: the objects of $\mathbf{S}$ are all the pairs (X, φ_X) where X is a compact topological space and $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous real-valued function; the morphisms of $\mathbf{S}$ from an object (X, φ_X) to another object (Y, φ_Y) are all the continuous maps $f : X \to Y$ such that $\varphi_Y \circ f \leq \varphi_X$. The composition of morphisms is the usual composition of maps and identity morphisms are identity maps.

Definition 2.1. For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the *α-shift functor* $(\cdot)_\alpha : \mathbf{S} \to \mathbf{S}$ on objects by setting, for every (X, φ_X) in $ob(\mathbf{S})$, $(X, \varphi_X)_\alpha = (X, \varphi'_X)$, where $\varphi'_X(x) = \varphi_X(x) - \alpha$ for every $x \in X$; we define $(\cdot)_\alpha$ on morphisms by setting, for every $f : (X, \varphi_X) \to (Y, \varphi_Y)$ in $hom(\mathbf{S})$, $f_\alpha = f$ regarded as a morphism between $(X, \varphi_X)_\alpha$ and $(Y, \varphi_Y)_\alpha$.

Instead of $\mathbf{S}$, we can confine ourselves to a sub-category $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{S}$ provided that $\mathbf{C}$ is closed with respect to the *α-shift functor*.

Definition 2.2. Let (X, φ_X), (Y, φ_Y) be objects in $\mathbf{C}$. For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, a morphism $f : (X, \varphi_X) \to (Y, \varphi_Y)_\alpha$ in $\mathbf{C}$ is called an *α-map with respect to* (φ_X, φ_Y). Furthermore, a continuous map $H : X \times [0, 1] \to Y$ is called an *α-homotopy in $\mathbf{C}$ between the α-maps* $f_1 : X \to Y$ *and* $f_2 : X \to Y$ with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Y) if

(1) $f_1 \equiv H(\cdot, 0)$;
(2) $f_2 \equiv H(\cdot, 1)$;
(3) the function $H(\cdot, t)$ is an *α-map* in $\mathbf{C}$ with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Y) for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

If an *α-homotopy* from f_1 to f_2 with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Y) exists, we say that the morphisms f_1, f_2 are *α-homotopic with respect to* (φ_X, φ_Y).

In plain words, an α-map for (φ_X, φ_Y) is a continuous map $f : X \to Y$ such that $\varphi_Y \circ f \leq \varphi_X + \alpha$, and an α-homotopy is a homotopy that is a α-map at every instant.

Remark 2.1. Any map $f : X \to Y$ that induces a morphism $f : (X, \varphi_X) \to (Y, \varphi_Y)_\alpha$ with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y), also induces a morphism $f : (X, \varphi_X) \to (Y, \varphi_Y)_\beta$, still with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y), for every $\beta \geq \alpha$. Therefore, an α-map can also be regarded as a β-map, for every $\beta \geq \alpha$.

We now introduce the relation of α-homotopy equivalence between objects of $\mathbf{C}$.

Definition 2.3. For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and every two objects (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) in $\mathbf{C}$, we say that (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) are *α-homotopy equivalent* in $\mathbf{C}$ if there exist α-maps $f : X \to Y$ and $g : Y \to X$ in $\mathbf{C}$, with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y) and (φ_Y, φ_X) respectively, such that the following properties hold:

- the map $g \circ f : X \to X$ is 2α-homotopic to id_X with respect to (φ_X, φ_X);
- the map $f \circ g : Y \to Y$ is 2α-homotopic to id_Y with respect to (φ_Y, φ_Y).

If the previous conditions hold, we say that g is an *α-homotopy inverse* of f with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y), and that (f, g) constitutes a pair of *α-homotopy equivalences* in $\mathbf{C}$ with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Y).

We observe that the α-homotopy inverse of f with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y) is not unique, in general.

Remark 2.2. If (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) are α-homotopy equivalent, then $\alpha \geq 0$.

To see this, we can take a point $\bar{x} \in X$ such that $\varphi_X(\bar{x}) = \min \varphi_X$. Possibly exchanging X and Y, we can assume that $\min \varphi_X \leq \min \varphi_Y$. If $f : X \to Y$ is an α-homotopy equivalence for the pair (φ_X, φ_Y), then, by definition, f is in particular an α-map for the pair (φ_X, φ_Y). The inequality $\varphi_Y \circ f(\bar{x}) \leq \varphi_X(\bar{x}) + \alpha$ implies that $\alpha \geq \varphi_Y \circ f(\bar{x}) - \varphi_X(\bar{x}) \geq \min \varphi_Y - \min \varphi_X \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_Z : Z \to \mathbb{R}$ be three continuous functions. If f_1 is an α_1-homotopy equivalence with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Y) and f_2 is an α_2-homotopy equivalence with respect to the pair (φ_Y, φ_Z), then $f_2 \circ f_1$ is an $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$-homotopy equivalence with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Z).*

Proof. An α_1-homotopy inverse g_1 of f_1 and an α_2-homotopy inverse g_2 of f_2 exist by definition, and hence $f_2 \circ f_1$ (resp. $g_1 \circ g_2$) is an $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$-map with respect to (φ_X, φ_Z) (resp. (φ_Z, φ_X)). Again by definition, a $2\alpha_1$-homotopy $H_1 : X \times [0,1] \to X$ w.r.t. (φ_X, φ_X) from $g_1 \circ f_1$ to id_X and a $2\alpha_2$-homotopy $H_2 : Y \times [0,1] \to Y$ w.r.t. (φ_Y, φ_Y) from $g_2 \circ f_2$ to id_Y exist. Thus, we can define a map $\bar{H} : X \times [0,1] \to X$ by setting $\bar{H}(x,t) := \begin{cases} g_1 \circ H_2(f_1(x), 2t), & \text{if } t \in [0, 1/2) \\ H_1(x, 2t-1), & \text{if } t \in [1/2, 1] \end{cases}$. It is easy to check that $\bar{H}$ is a $(2\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2)$-homotopy w.r.t. (φ_X, φ_X) from $g_1 \circ g_2 \circ f_2 \circ f_1$ to id_X. Similarly, we can define a $(2\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2)$-homotopy w.r.t. (φ_Z, φ_Z) from $f_2 \circ f_1 \circ g_1 \circ g_2$ to id_Z. This proves that $f_2 \circ f_1$ is an $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$-homotopy equivalence with respect to the pair (φ_X, φ_Z) with inverse $g_1 \circ g_2$. □

Remark 2.3. For every pair of objects (X, φ_X) ad (Y, φ_Y), if there exists a homeomorphism $f : X \to Y$ such that both f and f^{-1} are morphisms in $\mathbf{C}$ and, moreover, $\|\varphi_X - \varphi_Y \circ f\|_\infty \leq \alpha$, then (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) are α-homotopy equivalent.

Indeed, f and f^{-1} are α-homotopy equivalences for (φ_X, φ_Y) and (φ_Y, φ_X), respectively, with f^{-1} an α-homotopy inverse of f. In particular, f and f^{-1} are α-maps, and $f^{-1} \circ f$ and $f \circ f^{-1}$ are 0-homotopic, and hence 2α-homotopic, to id_X and id_Y, respectively, by constant homotopies.

We are now ready to define the persistent homotopy type distance.

Definition 2.4. For each pair $\big((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)\big) \in ob(\mathbf{C}) \times ob(\mathbf{C})$ we set

$$\Lambda^{\mathbf{C}}\big((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)\big) := \big\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : (X, \varphi_X) \text{ and } (Y, \varphi_Y) \text{ are } \alpha\text{-homotopy equivalent in } \mathbf{C}\big\},$$

and

$$d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) := \inf \Lambda^{\mathbf{C}}\big((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)\big),$$

where we use the convention that the infimum over the empty set is $+\infty$.

$d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ will be called the *persistent homotopy type (pseudo-)distance* associated with the category $\mathbf{C}$. When $\mathbf{C}$ is taken to be the whole $\mathbf{S}$, we simply denote $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ by d_{HT}.

In this paper we will follow the convention that $c + \infty = \infty + c = \infty$ for every $c \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Proposition 2.1. *The function $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}} : ob(\mathbf{C}) \times ob(\mathbf{C}) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is an extended pseudo-metric.*

Remark 2.4. The term *extended pseudo-metric* means that the function $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ is a function defined on $ob(\mathbf{C}) \times ob(\mathbf{C})$ such that, for every $(X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y) \in ob(\mathbf{C})$, it holds that (i) $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) \in [0, \infty]$, (ii) if $(X, \varphi_X) = (Y, \varphi_Y)$ then $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) = 0$, (iii) $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ satisfies the symmetry property, (iv) $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ satisfies the triangle inequality.

Proof. (1) Remark 2.2 implies that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ cannot take negative values.

(2) The identity map $\mathrm{id}_X : X \to X$ belongs to $hom(\mathbf{C})$ and is a 0-homotopy equivalence for the pair (φ_X, φ_X). Therefore $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_X)) = 0$.

(3) The equality $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) = d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((Y, \varphi_Y), (X, \varphi_X))$ immediately follows from the symmetry of the definition of α-homotopy equivalences.

(4) Let $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_Z : Z \to \mathbb{R}$ be three objects in our category $\mathbf{C}$. If either (X, φ_X) is not α-homotopy equivalent to (Y, φ_Y), or (Y, φ_Y) is not α-homotopy equivalent to (Z, φ_Z) for any α, then the definition of $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ implies that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) + d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((Y, \varphi_Y), (Z, \varphi_Z)) = \infty$. In this case the inequality $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) + d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((Y, \varphi_Y), (Z, \varphi_Z)) \geq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Z, \varphi_Z))$ is trivially verified. Therefore, let us assume that (X, φ_X) is α_1-homotopy equivalent to (Y, φ_Y) for some α_1, and (Y, φ_Y) is α_2-homotopy equivalent to (Z, φ_Z) for some α_2. Because of the definition of $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$, we can assume that $\alpha_1 \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) + \varepsilon$ and $\alpha_2 \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((Y, \varphi_Y), (Z, \varphi_Z)) + \varepsilon$ for an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$.

We know from Lemma 2.1 that $f_2 \circ f_1$ is an $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$-homotopy equivalence for (φ_X, φ_Z). It follows that

$$d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Z, \varphi_Z)) \leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) + d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((Y, \varphi_Y), (Z, \varphi_Z)) + 2\varepsilon.$$

By taking the limit for ε tending to 0, we obtain the triangle inequality

$$d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Z, \varphi_Z)) \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) + d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((Y, \varphi_Y), (Z, \varphi_Z)).$$

□

In Section 4, we will show that the persistent homotopy type distance can be seen as an interleaving distance. Since this reformulation may look too abstract, now we prefer to proceed with the study of $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ using the current definition.

It may be interesting to compare $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ with other metrics between functions widely used in the topological data analysis literature to measure the perturbations in the input functions. For example, the following statement immediately follows from the definitions.

Remark 2.5. If (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) are objects in $\mathbf{S}$ with X and Y homeomorphic, then it holds that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) \leq d_{\mathrm{NP}}\left((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)\right)$.

Now, if $X = Y$, then for any $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : X \to \mathbb{R}$ one has $d_{\mathrm{NP}}\big((X, \varphi_1), (X, \varphi_2)\big) \leq \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_\infty$. These inequalities hold regardless of the choice of the sets $\mathcal{H}(X, X)$ used to define the natural pseudo-distance d_{NP} as long as $\mathrm{id}_X \in \mathcal{H}(X, X)$.

2.1. **Comments on Definition 2.4.** We now consider three questions that may naturally arise:

- What if we simplify the definition of α-homotopies given in Definition 2.2 by removing the condition about being an α-map at each instant, requiring only it to be an α-map for $t = 0$ and $t = 1$?
- Would it be possible to define $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ via a minimum instead of an infimum?
- Is $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ actually only an extended pseudo-metric or rather an extended metric?

We will answer this questions by means of examples taking $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}$. Hence, we simply write d_{HT} instead of $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}$.

As for the first issue, the definition of α-homotopy we have given may seem more complex than necessary. One could think of removing the condition about being an α-map at each instant, maintaining only the request that it has to be an α-map for $t = 0$ and $t = 1$. Unfortunately, the new metric d^* we would obtain from this simplified definition of α-homotopies would not give an upper bound for the bottleneck distance in persistent homology. In particular, the vanishing of d^* would not imply that the considered persistent homologies are the same. This is shown in the following example, proving that the analogue of Proposition 3.1 (see next Section 3.1) for d^* does not hold.



FIGURE 1. In this case $d^*(\varphi, \psi) = 0$ but $d_{\mathrm{HT}}(([-1,1],\varphi),([-1,1],\psi)) > 0$. Observe that the persistent homologies of φ and ψ are different from each other.

Example 2.1. Let us define $\varphi, \psi : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\varphi(x) = 1 - |x|$ and $\psi(x) = (1+x)/2$ (see Figure 1). We also define $f, g : [-1,1] \to [-1,1]$ by setting $f(x) = 1 - 2|x|$ and $g(x) = (x-1)/2$. We have that $\psi \circ f(x) = \frac{1+(1-2|x|)}{2} = 1 - |x| = \varphi(x)$ and $\varphi \circ g(x) = 1 - \left|\frac{x-1}{2}\right| = 1 - \frac{1-x}{2} = \frac{1+x}{2} = \psi(x)$, so that the maps f and g are 0-maps for (φ, ψ) and (ψ, φ), respectively. Furthermore, $g \circ f(x) = \frac{(1-2|x|)-1}{2} = -|x|$ and $f \circ g(x) = 1 - 2\left|\frac{x-1}{2}\right| = 1 - 2\left(\frac{1-x}{2}\right) = x$. It follows that $g \circ f$ is homotopic to the identity (it is enough to consider the homotopy $H(x,t) := (t-1)|x| + tx$), while $f \circ g$ equals the identity. This shows that g is a homotopy inverse of f. As a consequence, $d^*(\varphi, \psi) = 0$. Now we can observe that the persistent homologies of φ and ψ are clearly different from each other, and hence the corresponding bottleneck distance is positive. This can be easily seen by checking that 1 is a homological critical value for φ, but not for ψ. Therefore, d^* is not an upper bound for the bottleneck distance. On the contrary, we shall prove in Section 3.1 that that property holds for d_{HT} (Theorem 2). This fact leads us to prefer the definition of α-homotopy, and consequently of d_{HT}, that we have presented.

As for the second issue, the use of an infimum instead of a minimum in the definition of d_{HT} could appear strange. Actually, this use is necessary, as the following example shows. The same example shows that d_{HT} is not an extended metric, but only an extended pseudo-metric, thus clarifying the third issue.

Example 2.2. Let us define $\varphi, \psi : [-2,2] \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\varphi(x) = -|x|$, $\psi(x) = 0$ for $|x| \leq 1$ and $\psi(x) = 2 - 2|x|$ for $|x| > 1$ (see Figure 2). For every small enough $\alpha > 0$ we can find an α-homotopy equivalence f_α for the pair (φ, ψ). As a consequence, $d_{\mathrm{HT}}(([-2,2],\varphi),([-2,2],\psi)) = 0$. In order to show this, let us consider the homeomorphism $f_\alpha : [-2,2] \to [-2,2]$ defined by setting

$$f_\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2-\alpha}x + \frac{2\alpha-2}{2-\alpha}, & \text{if } -2 \leq x < -\alpha \\ \frac{1}{\alpha}x, & \text{if } -\alpha \leq x < \alpha \\ \frac{1}{2-\alpha}x - \frac{2\alpha-2}{2-\alpha}, & \text{if if } \alpha \leq x \leq 2 \end{cases} .$$



FIGURE 2. In this case the infimum of the values $\alpha > 0$ such that an α-homotopy equivalence for the pair (φ, ψ) exists is 0. However, no 0-homotopy equivalence for the pair (φ, ψ) exists.

Observe that $f_\alpha([-2,-\alpha]) = [-2,-1]$, $f_\alpha([-\alpha,\alpha]) = [-1,1]$ and $f_\alpha([\alpha,2]) = [1,2]$. It follows that

$$\psi \circ f_\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} 2 - 2\left|\frac{1}{2-\alpha}x + \frac{2\alpha-2}{2-\alpha}\right| = 2 + 2\left(\frac{1}{2-\alpha}x + \frac{2\alpha-2}{2-\alpha}\right) = 2\frac{x+\alpha}{2-\alpha}, & \text{if } -2 \le x < -\alpha \\ 0, & \text{if } -\alpha \le x < \alpha \\ 2 - 2\left|\frac{1}{2-\alpha}x - \frac{2\alpha-2}{2-\alpha}\right| = 2 - 2\left(\frac{1}{2-\alpha}x - \frac{2\alpha-2}{2-\alpha}\right) = -2\frac{x-\alpha}{2-\alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha \le x \le 2 \end{cases}.$$

As a consequence

$$\varphi(x) - \psi \circ f_\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} -|x| - 2\frac{x+\alpha}{2-\alpha} = x - 2\frac{x+\alpha}{2-\alpha} = -\alpha\frac{2+x}{2-\alpha}, & \text{if } -2 \le x < -\alpha \\ -|x|, & \text{if } -\alpha \le x < \alpha \\ -|x| + 2\frac{x-\alpha}{2-\alpha} = -x + 2\frac{x-\alpha}{2-\alpha} = -\alpha\frac{2-x}{2-\alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha \le x \le 2 \end{cases}.$$

We can easily check that $-\alpha \le \varphi(x) - \psi \circ f_\alpha(x) \le 0$ for every $x \in [-2,2]$. It follows that $\|\varphi - \psi \circ f_\alpha\|_\infty \le \alpha$. Because of Remark 2.3, f_α and f_α^{-1} are α-homotopy equivalences for the pairs (φ,ψ) and (ψ,φ), respectively. Given that α can be chosen arbitrarily small, this implies that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}(([-2,2],\varphi),([-2,2],\psi)) = d_{\mathrm{NP}}(([-2,2],\varphi),([-2,2],\psi)) = 0$.

We claim that no 0-homotopy equivalence for the pair (φ,ψ) exists. We can prove this by contradiction. Let us assume that a 0-homotopy equivalence f_0 for the pair (φ,ψ) exists. Let g_0 be a 0-homotopy inverse of f_0. Then a homotopy $H_0 : [-2,2] \times [0,1] \to [-2,2]$ must exists, such that $H_0(x,0) = g_0 \circ f_0(x)$, $H_0(x,1) = x$ and $\varphi(H_0(x,t)) \le \varphi(x)$ for every $x \in [-2,2]$ and every $t \in [0,1]$. It is easy to prove that $H_0(-2,t) = -2$ for every $t \in [0,1]$, because $H_0(-2,1) = -2$, $\varphi(H_0(-2,t)) \le \varphi(-2)$ for every $t \in [0,1]$, and -2 is a strict local minimum point for φ. Analogously, $H_0(2,t) = 2$ for every $t \in [0,1]$. It follows that $g_0 \circ f_0(-2) = -2$ and $g_0 \circ f_0(2) = 2$.

Now, we observe that $f_0(\{-2,2\}) \subseteq \{-2,2\}$, because f_0 is a 0-map and $-2, 2$ are the only points where ψ takes a value that is not strictly greater than $\varphi(-2) = \varphi(2)$. Analogously, $g_0(\{-2,2\}) \subseteq \{-2,2\}$. By possibly composing f_0 with the reflection $x \mapsto -x$, we can assume that $f_0(-2) = -2$. From the equality $g_0 \circ f_0(-2) = -2$, it follows that $g(-2) = -2$. We can now prove that $f_0([-2,2]) \subseteq [-2,-1]$. Indeed, since $f_0(-2) = -2$, if $f_0([-2,2])$ contained a point $\bar{x} > -1$, it should also contain an infinite number of points x where ψ takes the value 0. This is against the assumption that f_0 is a 0-map, because φ takes its maximum 0 only at the point 0. Furthermore, $g_0([-2,-1]) \subseteq [-2,0]$. Indeed, since $g_0(-2) = -2$, if $g_0([-2,-1])$ contained a point $\bar{x} > 0$, there should exist a point $\bar{x} \in [-2,-1)$ such that $g(\bar{x}) = 0$, so that $\varphi((\bar{x})) = 0$. This would be against the assumption that g_0 is a 0-map. In conclusion, we should have that $g_0 \circ f_0([-2,2]) \subseteq [-2,0]$, against the fact that $g_0 \circ f_0(2) = 2$.

2.2. **The importance of choosing a subcategory C of S.** The reader could wonder what is the reason of defining the persistent homotopy type distance by using the categories $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ instead of just the category $\mathbf{S}$. There are two main motivations for this choice. On the one hand, we wish to generalize the natural pseudo-distance, whose definition requires to select a set of objects and a set of morphisms that may be respectively smaller than the set of all real-valued continuous functions and the set of all homeomorphisms (cf., e.g., Section 7.1 in [1], [3] and [13]). This restriction is analogous to the choice of the subcategory $\mathbf{C}$ used in the model described in this paper. On the other hand, some applications explicitly require to restrict the sets of objects and morphisms, as shown in the examples below.

The first two examples show that the use of a subcategory $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{S}$ allows to represent the L^∞ distance and the natural pseudo-distance d_{NP} as particular cases of $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$.

Example 2.3. For a fixed X, consider the category $\mathbf{C}$ whose objects are given by the pairs (X, φ) where $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, and such that between any two objects $(X, \varphi), (X, \varphi') \in ob(\mathbf{C})$ there is at most one morphism, $\mathrm{id}_X : X \to X$, from (X, φ) to (X, φ'), and this happens provided that $\varphi' \leq \varphi$. If φ' is not everywhere less than φ, then no morphism exists from (X, φ) to (X, φ'). By choosing this subcategory $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{S}$ we obtain that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi), (X, \varphi')) = \|\varphi - \varphi'\|_\infty$.

Example 2.4. Take the category $\mathbf{C}$ whose objects coincide with the objects of $\mathbf{S}$, while the morphisms from an object (X, φ_X) to another object (Y, φ_Y) are only the homeomorphisms f belonging to $\mathcal{H}_0(X, Y)$ such that $\varphi_Y \circ f \leq \varphi_X$. Form Remark 2.3 it follows that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)) = d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y))$.

The next examples provide more insights into the different outcomes that can be obtained varying the category $\mathbf{C}$.

Example 2.5. Let us imagine to be interested in comparing gray-level colorings of narrow strips (possibly segments), represented by continuous functions $\varphi : R_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}$, where R_ϵ is the rectangle $[-1, 1] \times [0, \epsilon]$ for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, and the value of φ depends just on the first coordinate (i.e. $\varphi(x, y_1) = \varphi(x, y_2)$ for every $(x, y_1), (x, y_2) \in R_\epsilon$). We will call each of these functions a *strip coloring*. Let us also assume that we wish to distinguish the generic strip coloring φ from its horizontal reflection $\hat{\varphi}$ defined by setting $\hat{\varphi}(x, y) = \varphi(-x, y)$, and that we are not interested in the heights of the strips (so that the strip colorings $\varphi : R_\epsilon \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_{|R_0} : R_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ should have a vanishing pseudo-distance from each other). Then a suitable mathematical setting could be obtained by considering the subcategory $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{S}$ whose objects are given by the previously defined strip colorings, and whose morphisms between two strip colorings $(R_\epsilon, \varphi), (R_{\epsilon'}, \varphi') \in ob(\mathbf{C})$ are the continuous maps $f = (f_1, f_2) : R_\epsilon \to R_{\epsilon'}$ such that

(1) f_1 depends just on the first coordinate;
(2) $f_1(\cdot, 0)$ is a strictly increasing homeomorphism;
(3) The inequality $\varphi' \circ f(x, y) \leq \varphi(x, y)$ holds for every $(x, y) \in R_\epsilon$.

Now, let us set $\varphi(x, y) = x$. We observe that if $f = (f_1, f_2)$ is an α-map from (R_ϵ, φ) to $(R_\epsilon, \hat{\varphi})$, then $\hat{\varphi}(f(x, y)) \leq \varphi(x, y) + \alpha$ for every $(x, y) \in R_\epsilon$. The definition of φ and $\hat{\varphi}$ implies that $-f_1(x, y) \leq x + \alpha$ for every $(x, y) \in R_\epsilon$. By setting $x = -1$, $y = 0$ and observing that $f_1(-1, 0) = -1$, we get $1 = -f_1(-1, 0) \leq -1 + \alpha$, i.e. $\alpha \geq 2$. It is immediate to check that the identity $\mathrm{id} : R_\epsilon \to R_\epsilon$ is a 2-homotopy equivalence with respect to the pair $(\varphi, \hat{\varphi})$, and that the same function is its own 2-homotopy inverse with respect to the pair $(\hat{\varphi}, \varphi)$. Therefore $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((R_\epsilon, \varphi), (R_\epsilon, \hat{\varphi})) = 2$. Moreover, it is easy to check that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((R_\epsilon, \varphi), (R_0, \varphi_{|R_0})) = 0$, so that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ satisfies our two requests. It is also interesting to observe that $d_{\mathrm{NP}}((R_\epsilon, \varphi), (R_0, \varphi_{|R_0})) = \infty$ (because R_ϵ and R_0 are not

homeomorphic) and $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}((R_\epsilon,\varphi),(R_\epsilon,\hat{\varphi})) = 0$ (because the homeomorphism $f(x,y) = (-x,y)$ is a 0-homotopy equivalence with respect to the pair $(\varphi,\hat{\varphi})$), so that neither d_{NP} nor $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}$ satisfy both our requests. This justifies the use of the subcategory $\mathbf{C}$.

It is also interesting to see how different choices of the subcategory $\mathbf{C}$ can lead to different pseudo-metrics, as shown by the next example.

Example 2.6. Let us fix the topological space $X = [-1,1]$ and consider the category $\mathbf{C}$ whose objects are given by the continuous functions $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$, and whose morphisms between two objects $(X,\varphi),(X,\varphi') \in ob(\mathbf{C})$ are the nondecreasing functions from X into X. Let us take the two functions $\varphi,\hat{\varphi} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by setting $\varphi(x) = x$ and $\hat{\varphi}(x) = -x$. With reference to the category $\mathbf{C}$, we have that the map $f(x) \equiv 1$ is a 0-map with respect to the pair $(\varphi,\hat{\varphi})$, and the map $g(x) \equiv -1$ is a 0-map with respect to the pair $(\varphi,\hat{\varphi})$. The function $H : [-1,1]\times[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, $H(x,t) = t(x+1)-1$ is a 0-homotopy from $g \circ f$ to the identity $\mathrm{id} : X \to X$ with respect to the pair (φ,φ), and the function $H' : [-1,1]\times[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, $H'(x,t) = t(x-1)+1$ is a 0-homotopy from $f \circ g$ to id with respect to the pair $(\hat{\varphi},\hat{\varphi})$. As a consequence, $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X,\varphi),(X,\hat{\varphi})) = 0$. In other words, $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ cannot distinguish φ from $\hat{\varphi}$. However, if we maintain the same objects and restrict the set of morphisms to the set of all increasing homeomorphisms from X to X, we get another subcategory $\mathbf{C}'$ of $\mathbf{S}$ such that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}'}((X,\varphi),(X,\hat{\varphi})) > 0$. Therefore, different choices of the subcategory $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{S}$ can produce different pseudo-metrics in our model.

2.3. **Examples.** In this section we present some examples showing how to compute the value of $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ in some simple cases. If not otherwise stated, we take $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}$ and denote $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}$ simply by d_{HT}.

In the first two examples, we show that d_{HT} may be different from d_{NP} also when the spaces are homeomorphic.

Example 2.7. Let X be the band obtained by gluing without any twist two opposite sides of a rectangle R, and Y the band obtained by gluing the same sides of R after applying a complete twists (i.e. a torsion of 2π radians). Assume that the glued sides have length equal to 2 and that X and Y are embedded into $\mathbb{R}^3$ in such a way that the cores of both X and Y coincide with the curve $C = \{(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2+y^2 = 4, z = 0\}$ and z takes values in $\{-1,1\}$ at every boundary point of X while it continuously varies in $[-1,1]$ for every boundary point of Y (see Figure 3):

$$X : \begin{cases} x(u,v) = 2\cos u \\ y(u,v) = 2\sin u \\ z(u,v) = v \end{cases} \qquad Y : \begin{cases} x(u,v) = (2+v\sin u)\cos u \\ y(u,v) = (2+v\sin u)\sin u \\ z(u,v) = v\cos u \end{cases}$$

where $0 \le u < 2\pi$ and $-1 \le v \le 1$.

Moreover, let $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\varphi_X(x,y,z) = z$ and similarly $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\varphi_Y(x,y,z) = z$. Then $d_{\mathrm{HT}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) = 1$ whereas $d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) = 2$.

Indeed, the cost of each homeomorphism between X and Y is 2 because it must take boundary points to boundary points. On the other hand, a 1-homotopy equivalence $f : X \to Y$ exists, that takes each point of X to a point of C, and whose homotopy inverse takes each point of Y to a point of C.

Example 2.8. Let $X = Y$ be the disjoint union of the lens spaces $L(7,1)$ and $L(7,2)$. Define $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\varphi_{X|L(7,1)} \equiv 0$ and $\varphi_{X|L(7,2)} \equiv 1$, and define $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\varphi_{Y|L(7,1)} \equiv 1$ and $\varphi_{Y|L(7,2)} \equiv 0$. It holds that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) = 0$ whereas $d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) = 1$.



FIGURE 3. The twisted band Y used in Example 2.7

Indeed $L(7,1)$ and $L(7,2)$ are homotopy equivalent but not homeomorphic [18].

Example 2.9. Let X be a contractible space and let $z \in X$. For some fixed $c \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\varphi_c : X \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the constant function $\varphi_c(x) = c$ on X. Simply denote again by c the constant function equal to c on $\{z\}$. It holds that $d_{\mathrm{HT}}((X,\varphi_c),(\{z\},c)) = 0$.

2.4. d_{HT} is the same in the topological, PL, and smooth categories.

Proposition 2.2. *Let* $\mathbf{C}$ *be the subcategory of* $\mathbf{S}$ *such that: the objects of* $\mathbf{C}$ *are all the pairs* (X,φ_X) *where* X *is a compact polyhedron, and* $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a piecewise linear function; the morphisms of* $\mathbf{C}$ *from an object* (X,φ_X) *to another object* (Y,φ_Y) *are all the piecewise linear maps* $f : X \to Y$ *such that* $\varphi_Y \circ f \leq \varphi_X$. *If* (X,φ_X) *and* (Y,φ_Y) *are two objects in* $\mathbf{C}$, *and hence in* $\mathbf{S}$, *then* $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) = d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y))$.

Proof. The inequality $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) \geq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y))$ holds because each morphism in $\mathbf{C}$ is also a morphism in $\mathbf{S}$. Let us prove the inequality $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{C}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)) \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y))$. Let ω_X and ω_Y be the moduli of continuity of φ_X and φ_Y, respectively. Let $f : X \to Y$, and $g : Y \to X$ be α-homotopy equivalences, inverse to each other, with respect to (φ_X,φ_Y). Let K, L be simplicial complexes such that $X = |K|$ and $Y = |L|$. By the simplicial approximation theorem (cf., e.g., [11]), there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ and K^ε and L^ε subdivisions of K and L with $mesh(K^\varepsilon), mesh(L^\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$, respectively, and a PL map $f^\varepsilon : X \to Y$ such that, for any $x \in X$, each simplex of L^ε containing $f(x)$ contains also $f^\varepsilon(x)$. Since f^ε is homotopic to f via $F(x,t) = (1-t)f^\varepsilon(x) + tf(x)$, and $mesh(L^\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$, it holds that f^ε is $\omega_Y(\varepsilon)$-homotopic to f. Analogously, there exists a simplicial approximation g^ε of g that is $\omega_X(\varepsilon)$-homotopic to g via $G(x,t) = (1-t)g^\varepsilon(x)+tg(x)$. Notice that f^ε is an $(\alpha+\omega_Y(\varepsilon))$-map with respect to (φ_X,φ_Y) and that g^ε is an $(\alpha+\omega_X(\varepsilon))$-map with respect to (φ_Y,φ_X). Thus, $S : X \times I \to X$ defined by $S(x,t) = G(F(x,t),t))$ is a $(\omega_X(\varepsilon) + \omega_Y(\varepsilon))$-homotopy between $g^\varepsilon \circ f^\varepsilon$ and $g \circ f$. Because f and g are α-homotopy equivalences inverse to each other, $g \circ f$ is 2α-homotopic to id_X. Thus, there is a $(\omega_X(\varepsilon)+\omega_Y(\varepsilon)+2\alpha)$-homotopy between $g^\varepsilon \circ f^\varepsilon$ and id_X. Because any homotopy between continuous mappings can likewise be approximated by a combinatorial version, possibly further subdividing K and L, we can approximate the $(\omega_X(\varepsilon) + \omega_Y(\varepsilon) + 2\alpha)$-homotopy between $g^\varepsilon \circ f^\varepsilon$ and id_X by a $(2\omega_X(\varepsilon) + \omega_Y(\varepsilon) + 2\alpha)$-homotopy between $g^\varepsilon \circ f^\varepsilon$ and id_X that is PL at each instant. Analogously, there is a $(\omega_X(\varepsilon) + 2\omega_Y(\varepsilon) + 2\alpha)$-homotopy between $f^\varepsilon \circ g^\varepsilon$ and id_Y that is PL at each instant.

Hence, f^ε and g^ε are $(\omega_X(\varepsilon)+\omega_Y(\varepsilon)+\alpha))$-homotopy equivalences inverse to each other. As ε tends to 0, $\omega_X(\varepsilon)$ and $\omega_Y(\varepsilon)$ tend to 0. Hence, the claim. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $\mathbf{D}$ *be the subcategory of* $\mathbf{S}$ *such that: the objects of* $\mathbf{D}$ *are all the pairs* (M, φ_M) *where* M *is a smooth connected compact manifold of dimension* n*, and* $\varphi_M : M \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a smooth function; the morphisms of* $\mathbf{D}$ *from an object* (M, φ_M) *to another object* (N, φ_N) *are all the smooth maps* $f : M \to N$ *such that* $\varphi_N \circ f \leq \varphi_M$*. If* (M, φ_M) *and* (N, φ_N) *are two objects in* $\mathbf{D}$*, and hence in* $\mathbf{S}$*, then* $d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{D}}((M, \varphi_M), (N, \varphi_N)) = d_{\mathrm{HT}}^{\mathbf{S}}((M, \varphi_M), (N, \varphi_N))$*.*

Proof. It may be proved in much the same way as Proposition 2.2, using the fact that any continuous map $f : M \to N$ with M and N manifolds can be approximated by C^∞-maps homotopic to f (cf. [15, Ch. 5, Lemma 1.5]). □

3. Stability of persistent homology with respect to d_{HT}

In this section we establish some connections between the distance d_{HT} and persistent homology, in particular we lift the Stability Theorem of Persistence via d_{HT}.

3.1. **Preliminaries.**

3.1.1. *Overview of persistence diagrams and the bottleneck distance.* In persistent homology, for each $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ one seeks to summarize the topological information contained in the sequence of sublevel sets $\varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty, t])$ into a multiset $D_k(\varphi_X)$ of points of the extended plane called a *persistence diagram*: a birth–death pair (b, d) of a homological feature in degree k gives rise to a point $p = (b, d)$ in $D_k(\varphi_X)$; points are taken with multiplicity in order to take into account the presence of multiple features appearing and disappearing at the same sublevels.

There is a natural notion of distance, called the *bottleneck distance* d_{B}, that makes the set of all persistence diagrams into a metric space. The bottleneck distance between two persistence diagrams D_1, D_2 is

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}(D_1, D_2) = \inf_M \max \left\{ \sup_{(p,q)\in M} \|p - q\|_\infty, \sup_{\substack{s\in D_1 \coprod D_2 \\ s\notin M(D_1)\coprod M^{-1}(D_2)}} \left| \frac{s_x - s_y}{2} \right| \right\},$$

where M varies among all the binary relations between D_1 and D_2 that are both right- and left-unique, i.e. partial matchings between D_1 and D_2.

The following result, which for fixed X expresses the continuity of the assignment $\varphi \mapsto D_k(\varphi)$, is standard:

Theorem 1 (Stability theorem [8])**.** *Let* X *be a compact polyhedron. Then, for all continuous tame functions* $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : X \to \mathbb{R}$*, and all integers* $k \geq 0$*,*

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}(D_k(\varphi_1), D_k(\varphi_2)) \leq \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_\infty. \tag{1.1}$$

In the above statement, tameness refers to a certain regularity condition singling out functions φ for which the homology groups $H_k(\varphi^{-1}((-\infty, a]))$ are finite dimensional for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and in addition, the maps induced at homology level by the inclusions $\varphi^{-1}((-\infty, a - \varepsilon]) \hookrightarrow \varphi^{-1}((-\infty, a + \varepsilon])$ fail to be isomorphisms for $\varepsilon > 0$ small only at finitely many points.

One of the salient features of the above result is that it assumes the underlying space X to be fixed. Using our construction of the homotopy type distance we lift this result

into a statement that applies to any pair (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) in the category $\mathbf{C}$ satisfying minimal tameness conditions.

3.1.2. *Persistence modules and interleavings.* More recently, persistent homology has been revisited in terms of persistence modules and interleavings. The main references here are [6] and [7].

A persistent module (over $\mathbb{R}$) is by definition a directed sequence of vector spaces connected by linear maps $\{V_\delta \xrightarrow{v_{\delta,\delta'}} V_{\delta'}\}_{\delta\leq\delta'}$ such that $v_{\delta,\delta} = \mathrm{id}$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v_{\delta',\delta''} \circ v_{\delta,\delta'} = v_{\delta,\delta''}$ for all $\delta \leq \delta' \leq \delta''$. It is said to be q-tame if the linear maps $v_{\delta,\delta'}$ with $\delta < \delta'$ have finite rank.

We now recall the notion of interleaving of persistence modules [6, §3.2]. Given two persistent modules $\{V_\delta \xrightarrow{v_{\delta,\delta'}} V_{\delta'}\}_{\delta\leq\delta'}$ and $\{W_\delta \xrightarrow{w_{\delta,\delta'}} W_{\delta'}\}_{\delta\leq\delta'}$, one says that they are $\alpha \geq 0$ interleaved if for each $\delta \geq 0$ there exist maps $\phi_\delta : V_\delta \to W_{\delta+\alpha}$ and $\gamma_\delta : W_\delta \to V_{\delta+\alpha}$ such that the following four diagrams (3.1), (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4) commute for all $\delta, \delta' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta \leq \delta'$:

(3.1)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_\delta & \xrightarrow{v_{\delta,\delta+2\alpha}} & V_{\delta+2\alpha} \\ & {\scriptstyle\phi_\delta}\searrow \quad \nearrow{\scriptstyle\gamma_{\delta+\alpha}} & \\ & W_{\delta+\alpha} & \end{array}$$

(3.2)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} & V_{\delta+\alpha} & \\ & {\scriptstyle\gamma_\delta}\nearrow \quad \searrow{\scriptstyle\phi_{\delta+\alpha}} & \\ W_\delta & \xrightarrow{w_{\delta,\delta+2\alpha}} & W_{\delta+2\alpha} \end{array}$$

(3.3)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V_\delta & \xrightarrow{v_{\delta,\delta'}} & V_{\delta'} & & \\ & {\scriptstyle\phi_\delta}\searrow & & {\scriptstyle\phi_{\delta'}}\searrow & \\ & & W_{\delta+\alpha} & \xrightarrow{w_{\delta+\alpha,\delta'+\alpha}} & W_{\delta'+\alpha} \end{array}$$

(3.4)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & V_{\delta+\alpha} & \xrightarrow{v_{\delta+\alpha,\delta'+\alpha}} & V_{\delta'+\alpha} \\ & {\scriptstyle\gamma_\delta}\nearrow & & & {\scriptstyle\gamma_{\delta'}}\nearrow \\ W_\delta & & \xrightarrow{w_{\delta,\delta'}} & & W_{\delta'} \end{array}$$

In what follows, for each non-negative integer k, $H_k(\cdot)$ will denote the homology functor (with field coefficients). Given a pair (X, φ_X) and a non-negative integer k, we define the associated persistence module

$$\mathfrak{P}_k^X := \{V_\delta \xrightarrow{v_{\delta,\delta'}} V_{\delta'}\}_{\delta\leq\delta'}$$

where:

- for each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $V_\delta := H_k(X^\delta)$, where $X^\delta := \varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty, \delta])$.
- for each $\delta, \delta' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta \leq \delta'$ the linear map $v_{\delta,\delta'} := H_k(\iota^X_{\delta,\delta'})$, where $\iota^X_{\delta,\delta'} : X^\delta \hookrightarrow X^{\delta'}$ denotes the natural inclusion map.

3.2. **Lifiting stability results via d_{HT}.** In this section we obtain a lower bound for the homotopy type distance based on comparing persistence diagrams.

The context of the following theorem is that of compact polyhedra and continuous real valued functions. Thanks to results in [5], one can still obtain persistence diagrams (for sub-level set persistence) without adding any extra tameness assumptions. Moreover, the resulting persistence modules are q-tame.

We start proving that the persistence modules of α-homotopic pairs are α-interleaved.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X, φ_X) and (Y, φ_Y) be two α-homotopic pairs. Then, for every non-negative integer k, the persistence modules $\mathfrak{P}_k^X$ and $\mathfrak{P}_k^Y$ are α-interleaved.*

Proof. Fix a non-negative integer k, and write $\mathfrak{P}_k^X = \{V_\delta \xrightarrow{v_{\delta,\delta'}} V_{\delta'}\}_{\delta\leq\delta'}$ and $\mathfrak{P}_k^Y = \{W_\delta \xrightarrow{w_{\delta,\delta'}} W_{\delta'}\}_{\delta\leq\delta'}$ where:

- for each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ $V_\delta := H_k(X^\delta)$ and $W_\delta := H_k(Y^\delta)$ and
- for each $\delta, \delta' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta \leq \delta'$ the maps $v_{\delta,\delta'} := H_k(\iota^X_{\delta,\delta'})$ and $w_{\delta,\delta'} := H_k(\iota^Y_{\delta,\delta'})$.

Let $f : X \to Y$ be an α-map and let $g : Y \to X$ be an α-homotopy inverse of f. For each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ let $f_\delta := f|_{X^\delta}$ and $g_\delta := g|_{Y^\delta}$ denote the restrictions of f and g to X^δ and Y^δ, respectively. Notice that from the fact that f and g are α-maps it follows that $\mathrm{im}(f_\delta) \subset Y^{\delta+\alpha}$ and $\mathrm{im}(g_\delta) \subset X^{\delta+\alpha}$ for each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$.

In order to prove that $\mathfrak{P}_k^X$ and $\mathfrak{P}_k^Y$ are α-interleaved, for each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ we need to provide maps $\phi_\delta : V_\delta \to W_{\delta+\alpha}$ and $\gamma_\delta : W_\delta \to V_{\delta+\alpha}$ such that the four diagrams (3.1), (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4) commute for all $\delta, \delta' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta \leq \delta'$.

In order to establish the commutativity of (3.1) consider the following diagram of topological spaces:

(3.5)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^\delta & \xrightarrow{\iota^X_{\delta,\delta+2\alpha}} & X^{\delta+2\alpha} \\ & {\scriptstyle f_\delta}\searrow \quad \nearrow{\scriptstyle g_{\delta+\alpha}} & \\ & Y^{\delta+\alpha} & \end{array}$$

Notice that $g_{\delta+\alpha} \circ f_\delta : X^\delta \to X^{\delta+2\alpha}$ and the inclusion $\iota^X_{\delta,\delta+2\alpha} : X^\delta \hookrightarrow X^{\delta+2\alpha}$ are homotopic by hypothesis. Indeed, since a 2α-homotopy $H : X \times [0,1] \to X$ between $g \circ f$ and id_X exists, the restriction of H to $X^\delta \times [0,1]$ has its image contained in $Y^{\delta+2\alpha}$, and is therefore a proper homotopy between the maps $g_{\delta+\alpha} \circ f_\delta$ and $\iota^X_{\delta,\delta+2\alpha}$. Thus $H_k(g_{\delta+\alpha} \circ f_\delta) = H_k(\iota^X_{\delta,\delta+2\alpha})$. Applying the homology functor to diagram (3.5) therefore yields the commutative diagram (3.1). The commutativity of diagram (3.2) can be established in a similar way.

In order to establish the commutativity of (3.3) consider the following diagram of topological spaces:

(3.6)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X^\delta & \xrightarrow{\iota^X_{\delta,\delta'}} & X^{\delta'} & & \\ & {\scriptstyle f_\delta}\searrow & & {\scriptstyle f_{\delta'}}\searrow & \\ & & Y^{\delta+\alpha} & \xrightarrow{\iota^Y_{\delta+\alpha,\delta'+\alpha}} & Y^{\delta'+\alpha} \end{array}$$

We now verify that this diagram commutes so that the commutativity of (3.3) follows by applying the homology functor to (3.6). Indeed, pick any $x \in X^\delta$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{(Since } \iota^X_{\delta,\delta'} \text{ is the inclusion map)} && f_{\delta'}\big(\iota^X_{\delta,\delta'}(x)\big) = f_{\delta'}(x)\\
&\text{(By definition of } f_{\delta'}) && = f|_{X^{\delta'}}(x)\\
&\text{(Since } x \in X^\delta \subseteq X^{\delta'}) && = f|_{X^{\delta}}(x)\\
&\text{(Definition of } f_\delta) && = f_\delta(x)\\
&\text{(Since } f_\delta(x) \in Y^{\delta+\alpha} \subseteq Y^{\delta'+\alpha}.) && = \iota^Y_{\delta+\alpha,\delta'+\alpha}\big(f_\delta(x)\big)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $x \in X^\delta$ was arbitrary it follows that $f_{\delta'+\alpha} \circ \iota^X_{\delta,\delta'} = \iota_{\delta+\alpha,\delta'+\alpha} \circ f_{\delta+\alpha}$.

One can verify that (3.4) commutes using a similar argument. □

Using Lemma 3.1, we now obtain the stability of persistence diagrams with respect to the persistent homotopy type distance.

Theorem 2. *Let X and Y be compact polyhedra, and k be any non-negative integer. Let $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions. Then,*

$$d_{\mathrm{B}}\big(D_k(\varphi_X), D_k(\varphi_Y)\big) \leq d_{\mathrm{HT}}\big((X,\varphi_X),(Y,\varphi_Y)\big).$$

Proof. Under the assumption that X and Y are compact polyhedra, and $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions, the persistence modules $\mathfrak{P}^X_k$ and $\mathfrak{P}^Y_k$ are q-tame by [5, Thm. 2.3]. By Lemma 3.1, if (X,φ_X) and (Y,φ_Y) are α-homotopic, then, the persistence modules $\mathfrak{P}^X_k$ and $\mathfrak{P}^Y_k$ are α-interleaved. Thus, the claim follows from the stability theorem for q-tame persistence modules over $\mathbb{R}$ [6]. □

4. d_{HT} can be seen as an interleaving distance using categories

The goal of this section is to review the previous sections in terms of interleavings. The advantage is that we obtain a unifying look at the distances we have encountered so far. The theory of interleavings was initiated by Chazal et al. in [6], further developed by Lesnick in [17], and generalized by Bubenik and Scott in [2].

4.1. General definition of interleaving distance.

We start with the general definition of interleaving distance between functors from the poset of real numbers to some target category.

Let $\mathbf{R}$ denote the poset category of real numbers (with a morphism between u and v in $\mathbb{R}$ if $u \leq v$). Let $\mathbf{O}$ be an arbitrary category.

Definition 4.1. Let $F : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{O}$ be a functor between $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{O}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ a real number. The *ε-shift* of F is the functor $F_\varepsilon : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{O}$ such that:

(1) $F_\varepsilon(u) = F(u+\varepsilon)$;
(2) $F_\varepsilon(u \leq v) = F(u+\varepsilon \leq v+\varepsilon)$.

As usual, given two functors $F, G : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{O}$, $f : F \to G$ is a natural transformation if, for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a morphism $f_u : F(u) \to G(u)$ in $\mathbf{O}$, and for every $u \leq v \in \mathbb{R}$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F(u) & \xrightarrow{f_u} & G(u) \\
{\scriptstyle F(u\leq v)}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle G(u\leq v)} \\
F(v) & \xrightarrow[f_v]{} & G(v)
\end{array}$$

Definition 4.2. Given two functors $F, G : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{O}$, and a real number $\varepsilon > 0$, F and G are said to be *ε-interleaved* if there exists two natural transformations $\xi : F \to G_\varepsilon$ and $\eta : G \to F_\varepsilon$ such that, for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

(1) $\eta_{u+\varepsilon} \circ \xi_u = F(u \leq u + 2\varepsilon)$;
(2) $\xi_{u+\varepsilon} \circ \eta_u = G(u \leq u + 2\varepsilon)$.

Moreover, in that case, ξ and η are called *ε-interleavings* between F and G inverse to each other.

Definition 4.3. Given two functors $F, G : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{O}$, the *interleaving distance* between F and G is defined as

$$d_{\mathrm{I}}(F, G) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : F \text{ and } G \text{ are } \varepsilon\text{-interleaved}\}$$

if F and G are ε-interleaved for some real number $\varepsilon \geq 0$, while $d_{\mathrm{I}}(F, G) = \infty$, otherwise.

Proposition 4.1 ([2])**.** *Let $\mathbf{O}$ be an arbitrary category, and let $\mathbf{O}^{\mathbf{R}}$ be the category of functors from $\mathbf{R}$ to $\mathbf{O}$. It holds that d_{I} is an extended pseudo-metric on $\mathbf{O}^{\mathbf{R}}$.*

Next, we consider specific target categories $\mathbf{O}$.

4.2. **The interleaving distance between sublevel set filtrations.** Let us take $\mathbf{O} = \mathbf{Top}$ to be the category of topological spaces.

Every continuous function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ defines a functor $T^\varphi : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{Top}$ by setting

- $T^\varphi(u) = \varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u])$;
- $T^\varphi(u \leq v) : T^\varphi(u) \to T^\varphi(v)$ equal to the inclusion of $\varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u])$ into $\varphi^{-1}((-\infty, v])$.

The functor T^φ will be called the *sublevel set filtration* associated with φ.

Given two continuous functions $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, and a continuous map $f : X \to Y$ such that $\psi \circ f \leq \varphi$, f induces a natural transformation T^f between T^φ and T^ψ defined as follows: for every $u \in \mathbf{R}$, $T^f(u) : T^\varphi(u) \to T^\psi(u)$: $x \mapsto f(x)$. Indeed, for every $u \leq v \in \mathbf{R}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^\varphi(u) & \xrightarrow{T^f_u} & T^\psi(u) \\ {\scriptstyle T^\varphi(u \leq v)}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle T^\psi(u \leq v)} \\ T^\varphi(v) & \xrightarrow[T^f_v]{} & T^\psi(v) \end{array}$$

commutes.

In this setting, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$, the ε-shift of T^φ is the functor $T^\varphi_\varepsilon : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{Top}$ defined by

(1) $T^\varphi_\varepsilon(u) = T^\varphi(u + \varepsilon) = \varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u + \varepsilon])$;
(2) $T^\varphi_\varepsilon(u \leq v) = T^\varphi(u + \varepsilon \leq v + \varepsilon) : \varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u + \varepsilon]) \hookrightarrow \varphi^{-1}((-\infty, v + \varepsilon])$.

Therefore, for any two continuous functions $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, the sublevel set filtrations T^φ, T^ψ are ε-interleaved if there are two continuous maps $f : X \to Y$ and $g : X \to Y$ such that $T^f : T^\varphi \to T^\psi_\varepsilon$ and $T^g : T^\psi \to T^\varphi_\varepsilon$ are natural transformations and, for every $u \in \mathbf{R}$, the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^\varphi(u) & \xrightarrow{\quad T^\varphi(u \leq u+2\varepsilon) \quad} & T^\varphi_{2\varepsilon}(u) = T^\varphi(u + 2\varepsilon) \\ & {\scriptstyle T^f_u}\searrow \quad \nearrow{\scriptstyle T^g_{u+\varepsilon}} & \\ & T^\psi_\varepsilon(u) = T^\psi(u + \varepsilon) & \end{array}$$

and



commute.

Proposition 4.2. *Let X and Y be homeomorphic. Denoting by d_{NP} the natural pseudo-distance, for every pair of continuous functions $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, it holds that*

$$d_{\mathrm{I}}(T^{\varphi}, T^{\psi}) = d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X,\varphi),(X,\psi)).$$

Proof. Let $f : X \to Y$ be a homeomorphism such that $\|\varphi - \psi \circ f\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$. It holds that T^{f} and $T^{f^{-1}}$ are ε-interleavings between T^{φ} and T^{ψ} inverse to each other. Hence $d_{\mathrm{I}}(T^{\varphi}, T^{\psi}) \leq d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X,\varphi),(X,\psi))$.

Vice versa, to see that $d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X,\varphi),(X,\psi)) \leq d_{\mathrm{I}}(T^{\varphi}, T^{\psi})$, let us consider two continuous maps $f : X \to Y$ and $g : Y \to X$ such that $T^{f} : T^{\varphi} \to T^{\psi}_{\varepsilon}$ and $T^{g} : T^{\psi} \to T^{\varphi}_{\varepsilon}$ are ε-interleavings between T^{φ} and T^{ψ} inverse to each other. By definition of interleaving, the restriction of $g \circ f$ to $\varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u])$ coincides with the inclusion into $\varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u+2\varepsilon])$, for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Analogously for $f \circ g$. Hence, for every $x \in X$, $g \circ f(x) = x$, and for every $y \in Y$, $f \circ g(y) = y$, implying that $g = f^{-1}$. Therefore, f is a homeomorphism. Moreover, $\psi \circ f(x) \leq \varphi(x) + \varepsilon$ for every $x \in X$, and $\varphi \circ f^{-1}(y) \leq \psi(y) + \varepsilon$ for every $y \in Y$. Thus, $|\varphi(x) - \psi \circ f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$, for every $x \in X$. This shows that $d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X,\varphi),(X,\psi)) \leq \varepsilon$. □

4.3. **The interleaving distance between homotopy classes of sublevel set filtrations.** Let us take $\mathbf{O} = \mathbf{hTop}$, the homotopy category with topological spaces as objects and homotopy classes of continuous functions as morphisms.

Given two continuous functions $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, and a map $f : X \to Y$, we denote by $[f]_{(\varphi_X,\varphi_Y)}$ the 0-homotopy class of f with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y).

Every continuous function $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ defines a functor $hT^{\varphi_X} : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{hTop}$ by setting

- $hT^{\varphi_X}(u) = \varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty, u])$;
- $hT^{\varphi_X}(u \leq v)$ equal to the homotopy class of the inclusion $i^{\varphi_X}_{u,v}$ of $\varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty,u])$ into $\varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty,v])$ with respect to the pair $(\varphi_{X|\varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty,u])}, \varphi_{X|\varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty,v])})$ (briefly, the pair $(\varphi_X^u, \varphi_X^v)$): $hT^{\varphi}_X(u \leq v) = [i^{\varphi_X}_{u,v}]_{(\varphi_X^u,\varphi_X^v)}$.

The functor hT^{φ} will be called the *homotopy type sublevel set filtration* associated with φ.

Given two continuous functions $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, and a continuous map $f : X \to Y$ such that $\varphi_Y \circ f \leq \varphi_X$, the homotopy class of $f : X \to Y$ with respect to (φ_X, φ_Y), $[f]_{(\varphi_X,\varphi_Y)}$, defines a natural transformation $hT^{[f]_{(\varphi_X,\varphi_Y)}}$ between hT^{φ_X} and hT^{φ_Y}. Indeed, for every $u \leq v \in \mathbf{R}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} hT^{\varphi_X}(u) & \xrightarrow{hT^{[f]_{(\varphi_X^u,\varphi_Y^u)}}} & hT^{\varphi_Y}(u) \\ {\scriptstyle [i]_{(\varphi_X^u,\varphi_X^v)}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle [i]_{(\varphi_Y^u,\varphi_Y^v)}} \\ hT^{\varphi_X}(v) & \xrightarrow[hT^{[f]_{(\varphi_X^v,\varphi_Y^v)}}]{} & hT^{\varphi_Y}(v) \end{array}$$

commutes.

In this setting, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$, the ε-shift of hT^{φ} is the functor $hT^{\varphi_X}_{\varepsilon} : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{hTop}$ defined by

(1) $hT^{\varphi_X}_{\varepsilon}(u) = hT^{\varphi_X}(u+\varepsilon) = \varphi^{-1}((-\infty, u+\varepsilon])$;
(2) $hT^{\varphi_X}_{\varepsilon}(u \leq v) = [i : \varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty, u+\varepsilon]) \hookrightarrow \varphi_X^{-1}((-\infty, v+\varepsilon])]_{(\varphi_X^{u+\varepsilon}, \varphi_X^{v+\varepsilon})}$.

Therefore, given two continuous functions $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_X : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, the two functors hT^{φ_X} and hT^{φ_Y} are ε-interleaved if there are two continuous maps $f : X \to Y$ and $g : X \to Y$ such that $hT^f : hT^{\varphi_X} \to hT^{\varphi_Y}_{\varepsilon}$ and $hT^g : hT^{\varphi_Y} \to hT^{\varphi_X}_{\varepsilon}$ are natural transformations and, for every $u \in \mathbf{R}$, the diagrams



and



commute.

Proposition 4.3. *Denoting by d_{HT} the homotopy type distance, for every pair of continuous functions $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, it holds that*

$$d_{\mathrm{I}}(hT^{\varphi_X}, hT^{\varphi_Y}) = d_{\mathrm{HT}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)).$$

Proof. Recall that the composition of homotopy classes of maps is defined as the class of the composition of the maps, and it does not depend on the representative. Hence, every ε-homotopy equivalence for a pair (φ_X, φ_Y) induces an ε-interleaving between hT^{φ_X} and hT^{φ_Y}, and vice versa. □

4.4. **The interleaving distance between persistence modules.** Let $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{F}}$ be the category of vector spaces on a fixed field $\mathbb{F}$. A persistence module can also be seen as a functor $\mathfrak{P} : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{F}}$. Replacing $\mathbf{O}$ with $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{F}}$ in the previous section, we define the interleaving distance on the category $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbf{R}}$ as usual.

A usual way to obtain persistence modules over $\mathbb{R}$ from topological spaces endowed by functions, is by composing the sublevel set filtration and the homology functors: for $(X, \varphi_X) \in \mathbf{Top}$, $\mathfrak{P}_k^X = H_k \circ T^{\varphi_X}$. In this setting, the interleavings between persistence modules are precisely those presented in Section 3.1. It is therefore possible to summarize the results of the previous sections as follows.

Corollary 4.1. *For every $(X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y)$ in $\mathbf{hTop}$, and every non-negative integer k,*

$$d_{\mathrm{I}}(\mathfrak{P}_k^X, \mathfrak{P}_k^Y) \leq d_{\mathrm{I}}(hT^{\varphi_X}, hT^{\varphi_Y}) \leq d_{\mathrm{I}}(T^{\varphi_X}, T^{\varphi_Y}).$$

Proof. Recall that $d_{\mathrm{I}}(hT^{\varphi_X}, hT^{\varphi_Y}) = d_{\mathrm{HT}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y))$ by Proposition 4.3, and $d_{\mathrm{I}}(T^{\varphi_X}, T^{\varphi_Y}) = d_{\mathrm{NP}}((X, \varphi_X), (Y, \varphi_Y))$ by Propostion 4.2. Hence, the claim follows from Proposition 3.1 and Remark 2.5. □

5. Acknowledgements

This work started during a visit of the third author to the first author at the University of Bologna in 2014 which was partialy supported by INdAM-GNSAGA. The first two authors partially carried out this research within the activities of ARCES "E. De Castro", University of Bologna. The third author has been partially supported by NSF

under grants grants DMS-1547357, CCF-1526513, and IIS-1422400. The authors thank Francesca Cagliari for her helpful advice.

References

1. S. Biasotti, L. De Floriani, B. Falcidieno, P. Frosini, D. Giorgi, C. Landi, L. Papaleo, M. Spagnuolo, *Describing shapes by geometrical-topological properties of real functions*, ACM Computing Surveys, vol. 40 (2008), n. 4, 12:1–12:87.
2. P. Bubenik and J. A. Scott, *Categorification of persistent homology*, Discrete and Computational Geometry, vol. 51 (2014), n. 3, 600–627.
3. F. Cagliari, B. Di Fabio, C. Landi, *The natural pseudo-distance as a quotient pseudo-metric, and applications.* Forum Mathematicum, 27(3) (2013), pp. 1729-1742.
4. G. Carlsson, *Topology and data*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), vol. 46 (2009), n. 2, 255–308.
5. A. Cerri, B. Di Fabio, M. Ferri, P. Frosini, C. Landi, *Betti numbers in multidimensional persistent homology are stable functions*, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, vol. 36 (2013), 1543–1557.
6. F. Chazal, D. Cohen-Steiner, M. Glisse, L. Guibas, S. Oudot. *Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams.* In Proceedings of the twenty-fifth ACM annual symposium on Computational geometry 2009 (pp. 237-246).
7. F. Chazal, V. de Silva, M. Glisse, S. Oudot. "The structure and stability of persistence modules." SpringerBriefs in Mathematics (2016).
8. D. Cohen-Steiner, David, H. Edelsbrunner, J. Harer, *Stability of persistence diagrams*, Discrete & Computational Geometry, vol. 37 (2007), n. 1, 103–120.
9. P. Donatini, P. Frosini, *Natural pseudodistances between closed manifolds*, Forum Mathematicum, vol. 16 (2004), n. 5, 695–715.
10. H. Edelsbrunner, D. Morozov, *Persistent homology: theory and practice*, Proceedings of the European Congress of Mathematics, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2013, 31–50.
11. R. Fritsch, R. A. Piccinini, *Cellular Structures in Topology*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
12. P. Frosini, *G-invariant persistent homology*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., vol. 38 (2015), n. 6, 1190–1199.
13. P. Frosini, G. Jabłoński, *Combining persistent homology and invariance groups for shape comparison*, Discrete Comput. Geom., vol. 5 (2016), n. 2, 373–409.
14. R. Ghrist, *Barcodes: the persistent topology of data*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), vol. 45 (2008), n. 1, 61–75.
15. M. W. Hirsch, *Differential Topology*, Springer New York, 1976.
16. M. Lesnick. *Multidimensional interleavings and applications to topological inference.* PhD. thesis, Stanford, 2012. `https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/9697564`.
17. M. Lesnick, *The theory of the interleaving distance on multidimensional persistence modules*, Found. Comput. Math., vol. 15 (2015), n.3, 613–650.
18. H. Seifert, W. Threlfall, *A textbook of topology*, Academic Press, 1980.

Patrizio Frosini, Department of Mathematics, University of Bologna, Italy
E-mail address: `patrizio.frosini@unibo.it`

Dipartimento di Scienze e Metodi dell'Ingegneria, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia Reggio Emilia, Italy
E-mail address: `claudia.landi@unimore.it`

Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `memoli@math.osu.edu`